

I N

REPORT OF ANNUAL CONFERENCE 1959.

Comrade George (Bloomsbury) and Comrade Brain (Swansea Group) were elected Chairman and Vice Chairman respectively.

Appointment of Tellers. It was agreed that the Standing Orders Committee act as Tellers.

It was agreed to take Amendments to Rule on Saturday afternoon.

Membership & Organisation.

Resolution 1. (Wood Green & Hornsey) "That this Conference appoints a Committee to investigate the method of election, scope and function of the Executive Committee, with a view to suggesting any improvements that might be made.

That the Committee's report be duplicated and sent to all members" Wood Green & Hornsey Delegate asked that Comrade Boucher be allowed to speak on this resolution for the Branch.

Resolution McKone (Wood green & Hornsey) & May (Paddington) "That Boucher be heard". AGREED.

Boucher (Woodgreen & Hornsey) We have been tossing ideas about in our branch as the present method of electing the E.C. leaves something to be desired. 1/3rd of the members who vote for the E.C. do not see the E.C. in action. We could perhaps have a small General Secretary's Committee to deal with routine correspondence, a policy committee, a finance committee etc. all doing the routine business and once a month or once a quarter have a general Party Meeting at H.O. or Conway Hall to discuss other matters. It would be more democratic. Conference might appoint 2 or 3 members, preferably members who have not been on the E.C. for some years but who attend H.O. regularly and could form opinions.

Bloomsbury Delegate. Because we don't see the individual there is no reason why we should vote for them. It is from the active membership of the Party that we elect the 14 E.C. members. It is a silly resolution and we shall oppose it.

Islington Delegate. We shall oppose. We thought there would be something revolutionary on this. Members of the E.C. are nominated by the branches and they should know who those members are. They are the active members who are nominated. It will be nothing less than a troublesome aggregate of committees if the Woodgreen Delegate's ideas are agreed.

Basildon Delegate. We are opposed to the idea of setting up committees and committees publishing reports costing about £50. We could do much better by our available sources. Why not put any ideas like this in concrete terms.

Woodgreen Delegate. The main point is that the reports we get from the E.C. are abbreviated and no distant member can form a true opinion of the E.C. and the work they do from those reports. A committee would conduct only the business handed to it.

RESOLUTION 1. LOST. 14 - 29.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE REPORT was read. Comrade Mayes sought permission to sit without credentials.

Resolution Webb (Hampstead) & Mostyn (Islington) "That the report be adopted and the delegate be allowed to sit". AGREED.

It was agreed to defer Item A for discussion until Saturday.

Item for Discussion B. (Paddington) The co-ordination and concentration of Party work at all levels to achieve the maximum result - to avoid the dissipation of much of our present effort.

Paddington Delegate. There are about 200-300 members in the Party who are active. This activity could be more useful if channelled and co-ordinated more than at present. The Party's propaganda is very little co-ordinated with our written propaganda. The S.S. from time to time is published with perhaps a leading article dealing with a specific subject. To get the full benefit from this it should in some way be linked up with the spoken word. e.g. Hungary where we fall down in this way. We made no co-ordinated effort to use the S.S. or organise meetings to deal with that subject. Last year at Aldermaston Paddington branch did try to organise something and if it had not been for Paddington branch the Party would have had nothing or little to say or do on this. The situation demanded activity not by a branch alone but the activity of the Party as a whole. This year they are marching back from Aldermaston, but the Party has not organised anything. Paddington branch has got out a leaflet but the D.C. could not read it because of pressure of work and we are publishing it anyway. Complete lack of Party effort. Efforts put into indoor and outdoor meetings are dissipated in some ways because of a lack of a finishing process. How many times at our meetings are people told of the possibility of joining the Party. We want Party speakers to tell people they can take a line of action - joining the Party and making our effort a greater one. We should have co-ordination of branch activities in various areas. There is a possibility of branches doing something together, having a joint meeting, lecture etc.

Woodgreen Delegate. This item incorporates part of our resolution which was just lost, when we mentioned the function of the E.C. Its function is to do work sent to it by the branches. It is not the function of the E.C. to have work outside that work. That is why we suggest small committees should be set up. What has been done about the coming election? It is the Woodgreen & Hornsey policy that this is a good idea and should be discussed with the idea of doing something and not just a lot of talk.

Bloomsbury Delegate. Two years ago at Conference very little was said on propaganda and I suggested it was about time we had a propaganda meeting on something important at that time - the Russian business. There was a resolution passed and in a few weeks time there was a big meeting at Dennis House. That was not enough. When there is a real target peg away at it. This H.Bomb business will go on and on. We ought to have consistent and consecutive meetings on this. It pays to have big meetings instead of small branch ones.

Islington Delegate. I don't think there is any doubt about it that when Paddington organised the trip to Aldermaston it was very successful and I am all for the idea of this concentration and co-operation between branches especially when meetings of other organisations are taking place to sell literature. An idea I have had for some time and it was once suggested at Conference was that one of the best methods of concentrating the efforts is for the Party to have a march. Members have laughed at 2-300 members marching. It would probably look very insignificant but if the Party cares to plan a short march it could think up some of the best slogans that any organisation could possibly think up. We could have a meeting in Trafalgar Square.

Basildon Delegate. We are convinced that the criticisms of Paddington branch are valid and that this is a case where the E.C. should confer with those concerned at a conference with Paddington branch and see if these ideas can be implemented. The Propaganda Committee, Central Organiser and the E.C. should put into operation together the ideas put forward by Paddington branch.

E.C. Member. I am glad to see that these sort of ideas do come up. More effective use of our propaganda could be made on events going on around us under Capitalism, i.e. Mikoyan's visit to the U.S.A., looking for trade and attending capitalist banquets etc. The Party is more concerned about 2nd and 3rd intellectuals and writing film and book reviews, not such things as unemployment etc. There is too much emphasis on secondary events.

Paddington Delegate. I hope it has been in the mind of members for some time that the most important Committee of the Party seems to have been the Propaganda Committee. The only time we hear from the Propaganda Committee nowadays is when they write to branches asking what they propose to do about outdoor meetings. There were two meetings at Dennison House, one organised by the Propaganda Committee last year and the other organised by Paddington branch two weeks ago. The first meeting there was nothing outside to show that there was a meeting and two people outside selling the Socialist Leader. The Aldermaston effort should have been organised by the Propaganda Committee not Paddington branch.

Propaganda Committee Member. I understand Paddington branch are doing something regarding the Aldermaston march this year. Propaganda has to be thought of by somebody. The Propaganda Committee is to administer the ideas of other branches, not just to initiate propaganda; it is to act on behalf of the Party. The Propaganda Committee can act quickly to publish leaflets etc. On the evening the Paddington branch held their Dennison House meeting there was no conflicting film meeting at H.O. Paddington branch have been promising a new platform for Hyde Park for some time but this has not come along. We don't do things at the last moment. We try to get things done in advance well planned. The C.L.S.C. are organising a literature drive in Trafalgar Square on Monday. We don't mind criticism but keep it in perspective.

Ealing Delegate. We should not underestimate the activities made by the Party. We did get out 50,000 Suoz leaflets in a few weeks. If there is nothing to co-ordinate the result is nil. Avoid this pitfall of indulging in a wholesale attack on central office administration and organisation. It is not easy with an active membership of about 150.

Woodgreen & Hornsey Delegate. One of the main failings of organisation in branches, committees etc. is that they are not able to foresee what is going to happen in good time. The main point is that we never had the leaflets when the main processions etc. were taking place. The organisation of last year's Aldermaston activity was left until the last moment but they have to be organised very quickly.

Dartford Delegate. No-one can interpret Paddington Delegate's remarks as an attack on anyone. The discussion afterwards did so. We can take back to our branches the remarks of the Paddington Delegate to investigate and wherever possible co-operate with branches in our immediate area to take better advantage of eventualities that arise.

Central Organiser. Perhaps the delegates are forgetting that earlier in the year we had a successful Branch Organisers' meeting at H.O. and I feel that this is a medium by which greater co-ordination of the Party's efforts can be achieved. Those present will remember an interesting and full discussion of a number of projects and propaganda problems and we are calling another for the 2nd week in April to discuss May Day etc. The delegates should go back to their branches and stress the importance of making these organisers' meetings a success because they can really be a means of achieving greater co-ordination and pooling of ideas resulting in better propaganda all round.

Camberwell Delegate. The main point is to do something about this item. The necessary machinery in the Party does not exist where these things can be efficiently organised.

Hackney Delegate. We are in the middle of a Parliamentary "Go". We suggest here is an opportunity of putting this concentration business into effect; it could be tested and all these people who want to do something can be down at Hackney and concentrate our efforts.

STANDING ORDERS REPORT at 12.30 adopted on the motion of Young (Hampstead) and Francis (Islington). AGREED

Paddington Delegate. Paddington branch are not getting at any committee on this issue and do not underestimate the efforts that the Party makes.

The members who are active and who are willing to do things, their efforts can be channelled into more useful lines. The Propaganda Committee member made interesting points - that primarily it is not the function of the Propaganda Committee to instigate Propaganda. I think it should be their prime function. If their terms of reference are to that effect they should be altered. It is a fantastic state of affairs that when the Party has a large meeting at Dennison House that there is a meeting at the same time at H.O. The Aldermaston March should have been brought to the E.C. and Editorial Committee last Christmas. These events when they occur do not always leave you three or four months careful planning - sometimes they are a week or two at the most, but if the Party goes about it the right way it can do it. 50 members who sold Literature in Trafalgar Square last June were organised in a few days by telephone etc. A lot of efforts in the Party could have been much more successful with a certain amount of co-ordination and co-operation between members.

FLOOR RESOLUTION: Bowie (Basildon) & Jacobs (Southend).

"That this Conference recommends the E.C. to call a meeting consisting of the Central Organiser Editorial Committee, Propaganda Committee and other members to put into effect the co-ordination of Party propaganda".

Basildon Delegate. A case has been made out for greater co-ordination in Party activities and we should realise that speed is the thing and by these means a machine can be set up which will do this then our purpose will be achieved.

RESOLUTION CARRIED. 29 - 0.

COMPANION PARTIES.

A letter from Comrade Franks in Vienna was read.

Comrade Jim Milne and Great Milne, the Fraternal Delegates from Canada were introduced by the Chairman.
Jim Milne addressed the Conference:-

Comrade Chairman and Comrades,

Don't be alarmed by the bundle of paper held in my hand. I have a greater sense of security and well being when I am facing an audience in possession of paper than when I am trying to talk by some other means. I have no intention of talking to you at great length. We arrived in London on Tuesday afternoon after a ten day journey from Winnipeg. Our purpose in being here is to visit the S.P.G.B to meet as many of the members as possible and to attend your Annual Conference. We are now realising this purpose. We have met a great number of members. We hope to meet many more and I must say that we are very definitely overwhelmed by all that has happened to us since we arrived on the train at Euston Station. To the delegates present and the membership generally we bring greetings from the Socialist Party of Canada. Included amongst the tapes which you will hear some time during this afternoon there will be one from Victoria B.C. one from Edmonton, Alberta, and one from Winnipeg. The one from Victoria B.C. records the voice of two outstanding workers for the Party, Comrades Chris Luff and George Jenkins. For many years Comrade Luff carried on a vigorous one man campaign against Capitalism in a state that is amongst the most conservative in Canada. The Party had its ups and downs its active moments and its quiet moments. Comrade Luff carried on and any opponent who had something to say or who thought he had something to say and wanted to say it in the daily press had to be very careful about what he said or Chris would be very definitely on his neck. A few years ago he was joined by Comrade Jenkins, a much younger man filled with knowledge and with enthusiasm. Between them they have had a tremendous amount of success in breaking into the daily press and other journals and putting the case for Socialism. Comrade Jenkins by the way has an article in the current issue of the W.S. which you have probably seen.

The tape you will hear from Edmonton was recorded by an old friend of the Party, Comrade Roy Devore. He too has been carrying on a one man struggle for many years against the system and during recent years he has managed to supplement his income as a part time newspaper columnist and radio commentator. His material consists mainly of reminiscences of an old timer in the Alberta northland and for the most part it is of little use to the Party although we who are in a position to hear and read his material sometimes get a little amusement out of wondering just how much his employers will let him get away with. His most effective effort from our point of view is a talk which he gave over a Western network of radio stations on the history of the Socialist Party of Canada. Prepared for obvious reasons from the standpoint of an onlooker it had its shortcomings, but it gave the Party more friendly and widespread publicity than we could possibly have paid for in a very long time. We obtained a copy of this talk and it too appears in the current issue of the Western Socialist. The final tape which we have brought with us, and which you will hear is a recording of Winnipeg voices. Of these members I will say nothing since you will perhaps know more about them than Comrades elsewhere in Canada. Now in addition to the recorded tapes, we have been asked verbally and through correspondence by a number of Comrades in the U.S. as well as in Canada to carry with us their personal good wishes.

Comrade Friend of Winnipeg for example besides sending his personal greetings to the Conference asks to be remembered to Comrades Eileen and Jon Keys. He met them during his brief visit with members last year and has not forgotten the special efforts that were made by them to make his visit interesting and pleasant. Comrade Rab in a note which I received from Boston shortly before we left sends his greetings to the Conference and mentions particularly Comrades Gilmac and D'Arcy from whom we add, we on the other side of the Atlantic have a very special affection. He also mentions Comrade Holt.

We also received a letter a few days ago from Comrade Reddy from Vancouver who asks to have his best wishes conveyed to Comrades Gilmac, D'Arcy and Walters. Comrade Reddy I would mention is one of the most energetic men I have ever known. A few months ago, a leading Vancouver newspaper, the Vancouver Sun, allowed one of its writers to insert in his column some nasty rubbish about the Socialist Standard and the S.P.G.B. This newspaper has been hounded constantly ever since by Comrade Reddy and this I think has been responsible more than anything else for the reprinting in the Vancouver Sun of several articles from the S.S. in addition to one or rather excerpts from one of our own leaflets.

Now other Comrades have asked that they be mentioned to you and that their greetings be conveyed but in the disordered state of the notes which I prepared I cannot now give you any particular references. But one letter to the Party in Winnipeg which I have will be of interest because it is from Comrade Fred Evans of the Los Angeles local, formerly of Winnipeg, and I believe formerly of the S.P. I have made some notes from this letter. "Glad to hear Comrade Milne will be in London for the S.P.G.B. Conference. I found it hard to gain entrance to the H.Q. in London. They have a front door but it seems to be seldom used. For sundry reasons they do not hear any pounding on the door. There is an alley in the back. You go down a few steps, remove a pane of glass, put your hand in and turn the nob on the inside of the door. This is how I discovered most of the members gain entrance".

We thought that rather amusing and we thought you would similarly. Fortunately, our own experience has not included devious activities of this kind. We found we were able to enter the H.Q. in a perfectly respectable manner.

And now there is no doubt in my mind, Comrades, that I have spoken long enough. You have the very serious business of the Conference before you and it goes without saying that you are going to attend to it with the same keenness and enthusiasm that we are going to experience in observing it. So let me say finally that there are no words I can use to fully express how deeply we feel about being amongst you and on behalf of the two of us, my wife and I, I extend all

of our fondest wishes for the present and future welfare of the S.P.G.B.. May your influence and numbers grow and bring with-in reach the objective that in the last two years has brought two members of the S.P.G.B. to the other side to meet us, and two of our members to this side to meet you.

TWO RECORDINGS WERE PLAYED FROM THE W.S.P.

It was agreed to send fraternal greetings to the W.S.P. etc.

STANDING ORDERS REPORT at 2.45. was read and adopted on the motion of Webb (Hampstead) & McKone (Woodgreen & Hornsey)

Resolution 2. (Woodgreen & Hornsey. "That this Conference

~~recognising thata~~) our opposition to war derives from a capitalist attitude and is not a pacifist one simply and solely arising from a principle of non violence and that b) civilian members of capitalist society because of the inter-related character of social production, may in some instances be engaged in tasks potentially more destructive and anti-social than some members of the armed forces - apart from the multitude of seemingly pacifist jobs e.g. (in agriculture etc) which are essential to a military effort and desiring to remove all possible obstacles to the sympathetic evaluation of the Party's ideas (especially amongst those at present engaged in well meaning but theoretically unsound actions designed to encourage opposition to a future war).

RULES that membership of the armed forces be deemed incompatible with membership of the Party".

AMENDMENT Camberwell & Islington Branches. Delete all after the word "Conference" In line 1 of the resolution up to the word "rules" in line 17. (Amended Resolution to read :That this Conference rules that membership of the armed forces be deemed incompatible with membership of the Party.)

Woodgreen & Hornsey Delegate. opening up. At the present time people all over the country are being drawn into the campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.

While it is true that this movement is theoretically unsound a fairly strong anti war sentiment has been developing within it.

What is particularly noticeable about this movement is the very high proportion of young people of both sexes which have been attracted.

A not insignificant proportion of them are hostile to the Labour Party and many are suspicious of all political Parties. As one of the essential factors in changing the outlook of any individuals (given that the material conditions make this change possible) is to ensure that the new viewpoint is listened to with a measure of respect.

We in our literature and on our platforms make very sweeping and resounding statements about our opposition to war. We know that our opposition is genuine - but what will these young and sincere people some of whom are potential Socialists think of our somewhat equivocal attitude to service in the armed forces. Are they not likely to say - "You are just like all the other parties - You say one thing and do another!"

It is not that we wish to institute any kind of heresy - hunting we wish to make the Party's position on this question unimpeachable and impregnable.

We think that it is not much to ask of members to resign in the interests of the Party or intending members in the armed forces, if they do not feel that a direct showdown with the military authorities will serve any useful purpose to wait until they have finished their conscript service before joining. To those outside, actions speak louder than words.

Came
OF EN
done
that
Let

*of the
Delegates*
Camberwell Delegate. We moved the amendment because the middle of the resolution was a lot of natter about nothing and we are concerned with the core of the matter and are of the opinion that members of the armed forces are of no use to the Party. Let us have a fixed attitude to members of the armed forces.

Fulham & Chelsea Branch. We are opposed to the amendment and the resolution because we feel that the present ruling of the Party that each case be considered on its merits covers all eventualities and does not exclude applicants who are already in the armed forces and who have a number of years to do and we don't see why they should exclude them from the Party.

Cambridge Delegate. We are opposed to the resolution and to a large, Woodgreen and Hornsey in their opening have given a case. The present Party ruling is the only safe one. It lets people to join the Party. We think that membership gives a feeling of belonging. You always want to do something for the Party if you belong to and they are just as entitled to be in the Party if they have the bad luck to be in the forces when that, four of us. The square basher does far less harm than the scientist who lets off the bomb.

Hampstead Delegate. The branch supports the amendment. This merely restates the principle, but in view of the confusion we should restate it. The principle is no.6 of the D.of P. We have no control over members of the armed forces and they have no control of themselves. How can we maintain the independence of the Party when we don't have control over members. We won't impress anyone if we don't state the principles.

Basildon Delegate. We were pleased to see this on the agenda as we have put it on twice in the past because there is a growing awareness among the comrades that to be a member of the Party is not only to give lip service to it but to act. We do not accept the excuses put forward by members of the Party that they can be members of the armed forces, provided they have a good case. We deny that there is any merit in a case as to why an individual should be a member of the armed forces and also a member of the S.P.G.B. It is not those who manufacture the bombs it is those who use them.

Non Delegate. It is a pity that through the Camberwell amendment the middle of the resolution has been separated from the resolution. Camberwell have taken out the arguments which are worth considering. Every Party member is expected to act in every possible situation as a Socialist. It is when he does some specific thing which is considered to be detrimental to the Party that we can attend to that. The borderline between uniform and others is indistinct and I don't think they will allow a complex thing like nuclear weapons to be in the hands of a uniformed man. He is more likely to be a member of the Civil Service and it has not prevented the Party sending members of the Civil Service as Delegates to the U.S.A. and Canada, and those members have put up as Parliamentary candidates etc. If a member voluntarily goes into the armed forces that is a separate case.

Glasgow City Delegate. The branch supports the amendment because war is not in the interest of the working class. We can say our hands are clean. A member of the working class may due to economic circumstances be forced to join the armed forces but let us get rid of that loophole and make it a scientific Socialist case.

Kingston Delegate. As delegates are instructed, suggested discussion was enough for a feeling of Conference to be given to delegates and we should get on to the more interesting items for discussion.

E.C. Member. It has always struck me that this is rather a luxury that we can engage because we are a small organisation and whether we keep one or two out of the Party makes no difference. If we get into the 10-20,000 odd size it would be ludicrous to say that we could exclude. If there is a sound principle to say that a member of the armed forces could not be a member we should stick to it. Things thrown up against the Party exclude members working in munitions factories, not members being in armed forces. Those who want to carry this are guided by sentimental outlook. It would be a sounder argument to ask if there was a principle involved.

E.C. Member. The case for incompatibility of membership of the armed forces and membership of the Party has been made out. When Hampstead Delegate quotes clause 6. of the D.of P. it is a sound unshakable point of principle as far as I am concerned. It shows a weakness in those who wish members of the armed forces to join the Party, but they don't argue that the onus is on us to establish our principles. If the S.P. were to pull up its socks a little more we might find ourselves holding better meetings during such things as strikes etc. There would be a case of paradox for instance if members were holding meetings while other members were in the army.

Newport Delegate. There is nothing incompatible in members of the armed forces taking up a Socialist position and the Party should adhere to the existing ruling. In some countries, firemen and police are regarded as members of the forces. We might have to exclude policemen from the Party. It is one thing to conscript someone, but another thing to make them do something. If we examine each case on its merits we have the necessary sieve to keep out elements.

Bloomsbury Delegate. If the Hampstead Delegate had read the whole of the D.of P. clause 6, he would have read the first phrase and he would have included all sorts of people.

Kingston Delegate. There is a bit of humbug about this discussion because Hampstead Delegate only read out part of the principle concerned. It goes on to say that the Socialist Party wants the working class to take control of those forces and that machinery of Government and convert them into the agent of emancipation.

E.C. Member. There is no principle in the D.of P. but the Party has recognised that membership of the armed forces is anti-Socialist and have debarred members who have voluntarily joined as they are automatically debarred from membership. One thing to remember is that the Party is an anti-war Party and you cannot separate war from the armed forces.

Woodgreen & Hornsey Delegate. Winding up : Most of the relevant arguments for and against the motion appear to have been put forward - also a number of irrelevant ones.

There does seem to be a tendency for some of the arguments put forward to be based on experience which is now not relevant to the present situation.

A Paddington member mentioned the necessity of keeping new contacts already in the forces as Party members in order to retain their interest. We would say that if this is necessary to retain their interest those persons could hardly be worthwhile members. Also, these are few and have to be set against the many who might be put off by our equivocal attitude.

Another Paddington member said that civilians are often in control of military projects and plants. We reject this as absolutely untrue. Such ventures are at all times under the strict control of the armed forces, even though technicians may be employed.

The main political forces are Act engaging in war, such as war, workers right

Item D. No Hackney joins the branch should for part act

The main point that we would stress is that members of the armed forces are active agents of the ruling class who are continually engaging in activities contrary to the interests of the working class such as war, strike breaking and the suppression of democratic and workers rights. (colonies).

AMENDMENT LOST 16 - 30.

RESOLUTION LOST.11 - 40.

Item D. Hackney Branch. Methods adopted for Joining the Party.

Hackney Delegate. When discussion methods of getting more people to join the Party, present procedure for joining the Party arose. New members are allowed to get the feeling that they do not belong to the branch, they don't come along after a while. I think that in some way we should encourage non members to come to a class which is specifically for non members. They would then have more knowledge and be able to take part in activities when they joined and be integrated in the Party's activities. They will be socialists before they join.

Islington Delegate. This issue is perhaps one of the serious and important in the present life of the Party. I have little doubt that at some time in the future when the Party is a larger organisation than at present it may be necessary for us to have some special kind of class of that sort but I am frankly horrified at the evidence of a lack of human feeling that appears to exist in some branches, of a lack of responsibility towards the Party on the part of individual members in the attitude they show to visitors. When branches receive a guest who is having a look at the Party, first of all branch business is automatically put back and there should be a state of friendly interest in this visit, and get to know members as individuals and the visitor gradually carried on by the thought and life in the branch. It is untenable that a visitor should go away without an attempt at contact being made. Hackney's suggestion is alright but I would stress the importance of taking an immediate and warm interest in any visitors to branches.

Lewisham Delegate. I am surprised to hear Hackney Delegate say that people go out of a branch because of lack of interest. It is all the more important that a branch makes sure that a new member is not left high and dry. He should be incorporated into the branch and helped; that is what the branch is there for.

Wood green & Hornsey Delegate. I can see some measure in agreement with Hackney delegate. We must work out a training programme for new members. There should be an initial book list, a list of all committees, their functions and terms of reference and a collection of useful information in a booklet for branch organisers etc.

Fulham Delegate. We guessed right about the purpose of this item and came to the same conclusions as the other members who have spoken. We also thought of an introductory leaflet to be given to new members; we should point out that members of the branch were there for the applicant to ask questions of and discuss any difficulties. We felt that one of the reasons for new members leaving was because they were not sure about being able to buttonhole members. Now members don't know all about the Party and its attitudes and we should get out a leaflet. Also suggested in the branch was that all applicants for membership should be welcomed first with open arms and sympathetic treatment and advise them to associate themselves with branches and members for about 6 mths. as a sort of probationary period to obtain information etc. and then make application for membership. That would also ensure that the applicant know what organisation he was applying for membership of.

Literature.

Resolution 3.(Islington) "That this Conference considers that the function of the Socialist Standard is entirely the propagation of Socialist ideas, and that the recent intrusion of poor quality articles, particularly those

Literature contd/

particularly those dealing with book, theatre, film and television reviews, are lowering the effectiveness of the Socialist Standard as a propaganda journal. The Socialist Standard in the view of this Conference, must aim at theoretical articles on Socialist theory, i.e. economics, politics, and history; and superficial articles and commentaries which do not substantially put the Party case should not be published".

Amendment Paddington Branch. "That this conference considers that the function of the Socialist Standard is entirely the propagation of Socialist ideas; it should explain and comment on world events in the widest sense of the term - that is, of what goes on around us. The main interest of the Socialist Standard must always be politics, economics and history"

Islington Delegate. The branch engages in quite a lot of activity in selling the S.S., selling at least 20 dozen a month. Canvassing is one of the most important activities we can indulge in now with the decline of outdoor meetings. Islington first complained about December about an article in the S.S. The E.C. replied that they were being guided by the S.S. Investigation Committee Report and that the article in their view was quite in order. It is because we are dissatisfied with this article and the correspondence that we have placed this resolution on the agenda. We are not opposed to writers putting in the S.S.

articles reviewing books or films. We have also made criticisms of articles in the S.S. in the past. The present criticism is that these articles are not substantially putting the Socialist case. Recent articles in the S.S. have been eulogies of particular authors and playwrights and although we don't want the D.of P. in each article, we do want the Party's case. We want you to support this resolution and not the amendment because ours is more specific. We don't hold the view that the S.S. should necessarily comment on everything that happens in this world. Our case is that the S.S. should contain primarily articles on politics, economics and history and there is scope for much to be written interestingly.

Islington Delegate 2. We have no opposition to film reviews providing they put the Party's case. In the March issue there is a film review that Socialists could not disagree with as a film review. We agree that function of the S.S. should be the propagation of Socialist ideas and endorse the remarks that the main interest of the S.S. should be politics economics and history and have stated this in our resolution.

Paddington Delegate. Speaking to the Amendment: When we of the S.P.G.B. come before the workers and attempt to tell them about Socialism we are telling them of the greatest single idea that has ever been thought of. Islington branch must believe that all that has been written in the S.S. prior to the "introduction of poor quality articles" has been alright. If this is so one wonders why we have not had more response to our articles. The logic of Islington's argument stands out as poor quality. We should make interesting skillful comment on all aspects of social life. It seems to me that Islington do not know the world in which they live and the role this party has to play. Don't pass anything here which is going to prevent people writing.. The very fact that an article may be on the question of films, books etc. does not preclude it from being an excellent article any more than an article on economics or history, which is the main topic which we should be dealing with. I want to see articles on all subjects written as well as they can be written. Let's go on writing and not clamp down on anything a member of this party wants to write.

Paddington Delegate. The main interest of the S.S. must always be politics economics and history. What are politics, economics and history, that is the question we must get fixed in our minds. Every social act is always a political one determined in its last analysis according to the economic structure of the time. Political economy always embraces all aspects of society. If we ignore any aspect of society our calculations will not cancel out, because we have omitted one of the important factors.

Literature contd/

Theoretical articles on their own give us only the mechanics of society without the essential living humanity which necessarily goes with it. It is today one of the most powerful mediums of communication. There is not one aspect of life or social problems that does not receive expression through the medium of radio, T.V. films, books, etc. Must we ignore these. This party is the one which can least ignore those aspects.

Hackney Delegate. I was under the impression that the movers were in favour of history, politics and economics, but all the speakers including the movers are not opposed to reviews.

Fulham & Chelsea Delegate. We are against the Islington resolution and in favour of the Paddington one because we think that a wider interest will be gained if the contents of the S.S. interests a wider field of people. If we limit the S.S. even Party members won't be able to read it. If people got the impression that the S.P. is so isolated from other important events in the rest of the world that there is not even a commentary or review in the S.S. they won't think very highly of us. We therefore welcome the inclusion of these reviews and we think that they are good, and that they will be better. They are making the S.S. more interesting to read.

E.C. Member. Some of the contributions seem to miss something that has happened and is likely to happen in the future, unless you watch what you are doing. If people don't know anything they don't learn from film reviews etc. It is not the established writers with knowledge of things who write these things, but a lot of people who have not got a firm grounding and have an itch to write, who take what they think is the easy way but have not the knowledge from our point of view to write on these things. You should let the Editorial Committee know what you want in the S.S.

Kingston Delegate. This is basically a human problem because what with these pious resolutions at every Conference, we tend to forget a very important factor, and that is that these articles are not written by professional writers but by Party members who have a lot of other things on their hands and writers who have to take very good care to replace by the younger generation. There is not a thing on which there is not a Socialist point of view. If we are as critical of writers as these resolutions seem to suggest, we would squash potential writers of the future and we ought to be a little more tolerant of people who write these articles, and hope that these will improve.

Bradford Delegate. We are going to oppose the amendment and the resolution because we think the articles on films, plays etc. are often useful and are not always bad; some are very good and do help the Party case.

E.C. Member. This business has been raised by Islington & Camberwell branches writing in about particular reviews which we think were of poor quality because they failed to put the Party's position. If delegates want to ask if we are opposed to reviews as such they fail to meet us on the proposition we are putting. When party writers make lukewarm comments and eulogies they are only aping the literary stuff in the Sunday Times or Observer. Such a writer is failing to do what only a Socialist can do.

It was agreed to defer voting until Sunday, and discussion continued.

E.C. Member. I had hoped to hear some reference to the manner in which Islington, prefaced by circular, had to say. I am prepared to agree that particular articles are far from perfect, but Islington put their criticism in a low and scurrilous manner. The underlying contention is much bigger than the question particularly of whether reviews of films etc. ought to be in the S.S. There is a much bigger issue involved, the contents of the S.S. as a whole.

The
of
Rev

Literature contd.

There has been growing concern over the ~~contents~~ of the S.S. and this should be added to as the circulation is dropping. Sales of the S.S. for the last 2 months (not included in the E.C.'s report) were lower still at 3,700. But has not the nature of Capitalism for the last 50 years may not be meeting the needs of working people in 1959. Not that Capitalism has changed, but the world that many people see themselves in has changed very much in 1959. You have got to change this fact. Is it going to contain something that people will buy and read.

Adjournment was at 5.30 p.m.

Conference was resumed Friday afternoon at 2.40 p.m.

Standing Orders Report read and adopted on the motion of Simpson (Ealing) and Hall (Bradford).

Amendments to Rule.

Resolution 4. Paddington: Delete on line 9 "showing member in good financial standing" Carried. 33 - 15.

Resolution 12. Woodgreen & Hornsey: Delete in line 6 "up to the 30th September" and the last three lines of the Rule beginning with the word "Vacancies" and ending with the word "resign" Carried 39-8.

Resolution 13. Woodgreen & Hornsey addendum to the rule as follows:
"The ordinary evening meetings of the Executive Committee shall commence as soon as a quorum is present after 7.30 p.m. If there is no quorum by 8.00 p.m. no meeting shall be held. Members not seated at the Executive Committee table by 8.00 p.m. shall be marked absent."

Lost 11. 35.

Resolution 16. Paddington: That the whole rule be deleted.

Paddington Delegate. We consider that this rule is worthy of being deleted. Any member of the E.C. is barred either from being a delegate at Conference or Delegate meeting and this we think is a rule that should go by the board because we think it takes away the right of certain members of the Party, namely those who are on the E.C. and have sat on the previous year's E.C. Today we are dealing with last year's work but a member on the present E.C. is precluded from dealing with work with which she had nothing to do. This rule was due to a certain amount of fear about power in the E.C. They thought that E.C. members could rig the procedure and move resolutions in line with decisions they had made and views they have held but I think the workings of the Party have shown that as a member they can do anything an ordinary branch member can do. This does not preclude them from talking at Conference. If he wants to move a resolution which in fact backs up the E.C. of which he was a member, then he has got the opportunity of doing that at his branch. It is rather an undemocratic rule as it bars ordinary party members from taking part in Conference and Delegate Meetings and we hope that those Delegates who have a free hand will realise the importance of it and even if they don't vote this year in favour, they will take the views which I have expressed and which Paddington have put around, back to their branches and discuss it.

Basildon Delegate. We are opposed and we are surprised to hear Paddington Delegate mis-quotes the rule in order to get support from delegates who have no instructions. The only reason that they are barred is that a member has been on the E.C. whose work is under review, and we strongly uphold this.

There was some further discussion on whether the rule applied to members of this year's E.C. as well as members of the E.C. whose work was under review. The Chairman said that the rule clearly applied to both.

Amendment to rule 16 - Lost 9 - 42.

Rule 20. Fulham & Chelsea Branch: That the first sentence of the paragraph reading "if demanded by any delegate a card vote shall be taken based upon the membership of the branches represented" be deleted.

Carried 26 - 23.

Rule 26. Fulham & Chelsea Branch: That the words "only" on line 1 and "the full number of" on lines 2 and 3 be deleted.

Lost 11 - 24.

Rule 29. Fulham & Chelsea Branch: That the whole of the first sentence be deleted and the rest of the Rule be reworded to read as follows: "Candidates elected to political office shall be pledged to act on the instructions of their branches locally, and by the Executive Committee nationally".

Lost 16 - 33.

New Rule. Fulham & Chelsea Branch:

Fulham & Chelsea Delegates. We of Fulham branch have had many occasions in the past to re-examine our Conference procedure and we place our proposal on this agenda now in the hope that it will at last be seriously and carefully examined. The details are open to improving amendments and the proposal can only benefit from constructive criticism. But let us face the fact that our whole conference procedure is undemocratic in the sense that Party Policies and programmes and alterations are largely determined by only those members who happen to attend their branch meeting when delegates were being instructed how to vote. This, without any regard to convincing arguments and valid contrary points of view which will most certainly be put before them at Conference. Further, the total membership of the branch weighs in (because of our proportional representation voting system) whether or not they have all heard of the item let alone discussed it. And more important, without having entertained any other opinion. What possible use, except for consideration at the NEXT YEAR'S Conference, is discussion and earnest persuasion when nearly all the Delegates have already been instructed how to vote and are not in a position to change their minds.

Whatever effect all this verbal exertion may have is, in the nature of things, largely forgotten before the time comes to submit items for the next year's agenda.

To be consistent and assuming, hypothetically, a hope, that we retain our present method we should only allow discussion after the chairman has ascertained whether or not there are any uncommitted delegates present. We would, to maintain this consistency, have to fix a minimum number of "free hand" delegates - say six - before any discussion were allowed. If there were less than six present the chairman would order the vote be taken immediately.

This you would never get away with, of course, because you cannot silence those who regard the Conference as their legitimate stamping ground. And, of course there are some others who merely wish to express a point of view. No, the only thing to do Comrades is to change the whole procedure.

It has often appeared to us to be a little short of time waiting to speak at great length to the committed - if not the converted.

Would our great Conference orators speak with such fire and fervour if they knew that not one damn vote would they win for their cause - because all had been decided in the seclusion of our own branch rooms?

Some branches, with the facilities and time needed, recognising the shortcomings of our present procedure, try to overcome this by circulating all branches with a resume of their purpose in putting forward an item and their arguments in favour. We think that this practice, besides being unfair to those branches which are not in a position to do likewise, is a very limited way of trying to decide Party policy.

Since our resolution - the proposed New Rule - largely explains our alternative in its wording, all that needs to be said about it is that it would remove the inconsistencies in our present Conference.

Procedure and would introduce a more intelligent and ~~SURR~~ method of ascertaining the views of members as well as being more democratic.

On the question of technical difficulties we are of the opinion that the Conference report which we produce and distribute at present could be expanded by the exploitation of any shorthand writers we may have. Or else we may have to hire and pay for one. Delegates already have to report back to their branches ((or they should do - they do in our branch!) Surely its not beyond the capabilities of delegates to make notes of the important points of contributions and to inform their branches of the pros' and cons' of any particular item. The proposed precis report will help them to do this.

Finally, don't come the old "it was good enough for my father" stunt. Remember - change is good for the soul. especially when it is a change for the better. (Only 1 free hand was present at Conference).

Fulham & Chelsea new Rule was:- The Delegates at the Conference shall discuss the items on the Conference agenda presenting the views of their branch, and - if at variance - the views of individual branch members, with the object of enabling the delegates present to make notes and to report back to their respective branches the various opinions expressed. Then branches have considered their delegates' reports (in conjunction with a precis report of the contributions to the discussion at the Conference, copies of which shall be sent to all branches) the branch shall then vote on a voting form which shall list all resolutions and recommendations raised at the Conference. Only those present in the branch may vote. The voting forms shall be sent to Head Office and copies of a master form, showing totals of votes cast, shall be sent to all branches.

In order to make this proposed new rule operative RULE 22 to be amended by deleting "and vote" on line 7, and all after "Conference" on line 8.

Resolution Wren & Hornsey. That this rule becomes operative only when the Party possesses the necessary facilities for the production and distribution of first class verbatim reports."

Belling Delegates. Fulham's particular item works against what the delegate has been saying. The reason why delegates have only one free hand is because the item has been on the agenda for 5 years running and they know what it is all about.

Camberwell Delegates. The branch discussed this at great length and came to the conclusion that it would be very cumbersome and incur a lot of extra work and that its disadvantages outweigh the advantages and therefore we are opposed.

Hampstead Delegates. About free hands it is not quite so simple as Fulham thinks. In the case of an instructed vote we are instructed by a majority of the branch. Anomalies have occurred in the past but if it is the case that somebody is nominated in the branch who disagrees with something the branch wishes to instruct the delegates to do, he should refuse nomination. The main criticism in Hampstead branch was that Fulham is trying to put the procedure in reverse whereas now we have a proposition made and discussed and instructions which go to Conference. Minds can be changed. Only those present at the branch under the new procedure will be able to vote. This is a very cumbersome and protracted procedure to arrive at pretty well the same conclusion.

Dartford Delegates. asked to hear from the General Secretary as to what work would be entailed at H.O. and whether it would be possible.

General Secretary. My views as General Secretary and as an individual are that we are going to have a lot more work to do. We already have too much to do but if this is democratically passed, we would have to try to adapt ourselves to it. We would have to either employ someone to do the verbatim report or train our own writers. We now employ 2 shorthand writers on the platform and with the present help available it would be very nigh impossible to carry out what Fulham want.

MEMBERSHIP & ORGANISATION.

Item for discussion . Glasgow City & Kelvin Grove Branches.

Head Office and Provincial Branches.

Glasgow City Delegates. Our item is in two parts, one concerns correspondence relations with H.O. and the second concerns propaganda relations with H.O. There are no aspersions being passed on particular Party members. (H. then spoke at great length regarding Form F. sent to H.O., Forms C, requests not complied with and correspondence not replied to.) Regarding propaganda, the members went to Dundee last year but the first intimation we had of this was when it appeared in E.C. minutes. We have asked for speakers for May Day and have great difficulty in obtaining them, but members are sent to Dundee without asking us in Glasgow if we could send speakers. There have been meetings in Edinburgh but they don't appear on the Minutes Form C. We are completely unaware of what is going on until we see it in E.C. minutes or get a personal report. The Propaganda Committee should approach the two Glasgow branches to see what their resources are, and there should be closer liaison.

Chairman. suggested that much of this could have been dealt with through the General Secretary, the E.C. and the Central Organiser and if no satisfaction were obtained then put it before Conference.

Kelvingrove Delegates. On the surface this may appear a trivial matter but it is not. We wrote to the E.C. to be reimbursed for expenses of Delegates. They asked for details and we replied asking why. We refused to do this on the grounds that it had not been the practice in the past and so far as we know there had been no new ruling on the matter. We wanted to know from the Finance Committee how much was granted to members by way of expenses but received no satisfactory answer. All this has a bad effect on the branch: they feel it is no good approaching H.O.

Chairman. suggested that delegates should try to speak to the Central Organiser and General Secretary to try to straighten these matters out and not discuss them here.

Resolution James & Pore (Nottingham). : "That this Conference recommends that the matter be referred to the Central Organiser for early report back to the E.C."

Amendment H. Young & J. Young (Hampstead). : "That this Conference appoints three of its delegates to investigate the complaints and report back to Conference on Sunday morning".

Hampstead Delegate. The fairest way for everyone concerned is to have 3 delegates to investigate the matter.

Nottingham Delegate. We are opposed to the amendment as it is the Central Organiser's job to look into the matter. The appointment of 3 delegates imputes that there is something wrong going on.

Islington Delegate. I would support the amendment because I would like to hear more about delegates' expenses and I think the Conference should discuss that.

Glasgow City Delegates. I support the amendment. I don't know if Conference will recall that Glasgow City once had occasion to lapse 20 members because of repeated failure to pay dues and answer correspondence. The E.C. decided that they were not going to ratify this until they had a Central Organiser's report. That was about 5 years ago and the report has not been made.

Amendment Carried 21 - 12.

Sub. Res. Agreed.

Resolution H. & J. Young (Hampstead) "That Comrades Hampson, Cox & Walby be appointed". AGREED.

RESOLUTION 3. (Literature) (Continued)

Pay
the
propa-
These o
have the
the
for
he

Islington Delegates. I think this is a matter that is most important particularly as the S.S. is 95% of our propaganda. Islington is accused of a scurrilous attack on the writers. I deny this. We attacked articles not the writers. I would quote "Subject Normal". Has the Party ever had a writer? I would consider this a lot of rubbish. I was not present at this article. If these kind of articles get into the S.S. I would say "If we want to offer them for sale because I should be asked". This it has nothing whatever to do with Socialism.

Hanworth. It appears that the arguments for and against the type of article that should go in the S.S. don't amount to a principle. Islington are not opposed to reviewing films, books, etc. but to the quality of the articles. I cannot quarrel with this but to what extent do we have to state the Party case. It boils down to the question of what is the best way of communicating to people the Socialist case. We have never attempted to reach people at their own level. Let us also have articles on topics which people can identify themselves with.

Patterson. From what Islington Delegate has said we can come to a reasonable agreement that none of us are always going to be satisfied with the S.S. In the Islington circular is an attitude that concerning the problems of the world in general only the S.P. have got anything. Not only the S.P. have something to say about social problems. People can write as well if not better than members of the S.P. The E.C. have agreed with the general spirit of the report of the S.S. Investigation Committee when dealing with this item on the E.C.

Nottingham. Islington Delegate has said that she is not attacking the Party but the articles. Most of these articles are from the writers of the Party by Castell and Wilmett and most of the views of members of Islington branch which I have heard are divided as to whether it is the quality of the articles or the subject matter. This is an attempt to divert attention from a point of contact. If the branch is merely attacking the articles on the basis of quality they should say so. I can refer to old S.S.'s with a lot of rubbish in them. We must look at it in the light of an experiment and criticism in a constructive manner.

E.C. Member. Ever since the S.S. Investigation Committee report the E.C. has been at it meeting after meeting and the E.C. have arrived at certain conclusions and perhaps some of you have not looked at it sufficiently before coming along with this proposition. Islington wanted to get some view expressed by Conference on this type of article and tie it up with a declaration of policy and Paddington moved an amendment to that particular section and it is now down to are you going to lay down a policy for future guidance or leave it as at present. The merits of these articles have been exaggerated on both sides and are not worth the discussion we have had. Islington's resolution is incredibly narrow and would be impossible to work. If this is passed there will be a lot of argument as to whether this rules out any arguments as the articles will have to be entirely the propagation of Socialist ideas. The policy statement of the S.S. Investigation Committee tried to cover a large field. The E.C.'s statement is a much wider proposition than either of these two.

Amendment Carried 34 - 17.

Amendment as Sub.Rcs. Carried 37 - 14.

Resolution 4. (Paddington). That this Conference holds the view that the Socialist Standard now forms the most important channel of propaganda and that the Party must be prepared to spend more money on the production distribution and advertising of the Socialist Standard, even if this involves a greater loss on each issue. A minimum of £10 per month be allocated to advertise the Socialist Standard.

Amendment Islington Branch. Delete "A minimum of £10 per month be allocated to advertise the Socialist Standard" and insert instead "as much money as can be afforded be allocated to advertise the Socialist Standard".

Paddington Delegate. We are endeavouring to get delegates to look at the S.S. in its correct perspective; as the spearhead of our propaganda. There can be no argument as to the falling off of outdoor propaganda due to changing social habits and changing face of London. These outdoor stations were one of the main outlets of the Party in the sales of the S.S. The S.S. is in a very serious position; sales have declined to 3,700. Canvassing is the main way we now have to sell the S.S. but it is not a solid foundation in looking to canvassing for selling the S.S. We think we have got to spend money on it and have suggested that at least a minimum of £10 a month be spent on advertising it. Members say the Party cannot afford to do this - that we should increase the selling price or increase the sales. Obviously the way to off-set this should be to increase sales. Advertising should be more methodical. We don't feel it was a waste of money to spend £20 on a meeting at Denison House and collect £20, but when dealing with the S.S. members panic about this. I don't think Islington's amendment is good enough. £10 a month will be forthcoming. It should be used in a co-ordinated way. The money should be spread out in a series of adverts perhaps in the same journal dealing with the various articles that appear in it and the sales should be based on subscribers.

Islington Delegate. We think £10 is not enough by any means. Canvassing is not being enough attention. When members talk about a fund for the S.S. they mean instead of canvassing, they will contribute money to a fund. I think this is ridiculous. We often give the S.S. to people as canvassers, and contribute out of our own pockets. You have got to make time to canvass. One way of advertising the S.S. would be for a printing machine to print on all our correspondence something like "read the S.S.".

Hackney Delegate. Islington says that £10 is not enough but Paddington branch says that £10 is a minimum amount. Paddington and Hackney want as much spent on the S.S. as is spent on meetings. I submit that behind Islington's amendment is that the amount spent should be what the E.C. say we can afford. Who is to say how much we should spend? Envelopes "read the S.S." would only be seen by those who receive it and the postman and would not have a great deal of effect.

Bloomsbury Delegate. I don't think we can spend too much money on advertising the S.S. but we must be careful how we advertise it. If we find a good method, exploit it. I am for the amendment because it means no limit.

Paddington Delegate. Delegates aren't getting what Paddington is driving at. Every year we hear that sales are dropping for various reasons. We should be faced with the possibility of always subsidising the S.S. The point is we should be committed to do something about expanding in the form of advertising. If we vote for the Islington amendment it would mean that the E.C. may decide that we cannot afford anything and in consequence nothing would be done. Our propaganda should be central around our journal and instead of worrying about the drop in revenues so far as contributions are concerned it would be a good idea to combine the two and make all party members automatic subscribers to the S.S. All members may not have the S.S.

Amendment Carried 31 - 20.

Sub.Res.Carried 37 - 15.

Resolution 5. (Hackney & Paddington.): "That this Conference holds that there should be a correspondence section in the Socialist Standard and therefore instructs the Executive Committee that

1. Letters should be edited with regard to length and interest.
2. Letters from critics should-as now-be answered in the same issue of the Socialist Standard.
3. Appreciative and helpful letters, as well as critical ones, should be published, and members of the Party encouraged to send letters expressing constructive views.

Literature Contd.

Amend it Glasgow City Branch: Delete from clause iii the words "and member of the Party encouraged to send letters expressing constructive views"

Amendment Hampstead Branch. Delete subsection iii.

Paddington Delegate. This resolution incorporates the three points made in section 7 of the I.S. Investigation Committee's report, on the subject of correspondence.

Item 1. "Letters should be edited with regard to length and interest".

Sometimes, what the correspondent has to say, can only be said at length, and if the letter is worthwhile it should be published in its entirety. On the other hand, many letters are long because the writer is incapable of expressing himself with economy.

These should be cut with all due care by the editor. Editing a correspondence column also means selectivity; letters which in the editor's opinion are of no consequence should of course not be published.

Item 2. "Letters from critics should - as now - be answered in the same issue of the S.S."

This is of course quite in order. No letter criticising the Party, or sinking information should be printed without a reply.

Item 3. "Appreciative and helpful letters as well as critical ones should be published, and members of the Party encouraged to send letters expressing constructive views"

As to appreciative and helpful letters, I put it to you that it would come as a pleasant surprise to find that people might happen to agree with what we have to say. Particularly if such letters came from people who had read the S.S. for the first time.

It might even be that a writer had some helpful knowledge on a subject that had somehow escaped us.

Letters from members of the Party should be encouraged, for there are many interesting points and observations which could not (and should not) be stretched into an article, that could usefully be contained in a Correspondence Column.

If as the Editorial Committee state, that no or at least very few worthwhile letters are received, it is up to members to do something about this: start the ball rolling and make correspondence an accepted feature of the S.S.

//Quote from Resolution//

"There is no paper or Journal of any consequence that does not run as a central feature, a correspondence column."

Not necessarily (lets face it) because they are interested in their reader's opinions, but because (and note this) because it is a selling feature.

We on the contrary are interested in our readers opinions, but we are also interested in as many selling features as we can use.

A correspondence column is often the first thing many people read, because what other readers of the same paper think is of considerable interest to them.

I therefore submit to this conference, that it supports this resolution in the interests of an improved and far reaching Socialist Standard.

Hampstead Delegate. When we can't get correspondence in the S.S. we get members writing in disguise. It is a fundamental infringement that members should write correcting articles in the S.S.

Glasgow City Delegate. We agree with Paddington's recommendations but letters from members would be queer and curious as in the past and that is why we have moved this amendment. It would be in line with other journals in not inviting letters from members of the Editorial board and members of the staff.

E.C.Member. On the general idea about correspondence, the suggestions put forward are quite good and acceptable, but what is the aim of

correspondence in the S.S. and to what extent does it serve its purpose. Paddington Branch has chosen to dig up what has happened in the last two years and lay the responsibility on the Editorial Committee. There is an innuendo in Paddington's circular that the Editorial Committee mishandles the correspondence. This is not true. Of the correspondence since 1957 when this began, most were about religion, 5 of the letters written by Party members. There were other subjects written about - which were useful and of good interest. If delegates don't want this correspondence they should make it clear to the Editorial Committee. If we must have restriction, keep it to the limit. Several readers have written to say how much they appreciate the fact that they can write in. No-one feels satisfied if his political opponents cut down his letter.

HAMPSTEAD AMENDMENT LOST 21 - 30.
GLASGOW CITY AMENDMENT CARRIED 31 - 20.

RESOLUTION CARRIED 40 - 12.

Resolution 6. Paddington Branch: "That the Editorial Committee be enlarged to six members, all of whom will have equal responsibility for the production of the Socialist Standard"

Amendment Bradford Branch: Delete "six" and insert instead "five".

AMENDMENT LOST. 11 - 34.

Resolution Lost. 18 - 32.

THE ADJOURNMENT WAS MOVED - AGREED.

SUNDAY SESSION.

Item for Discussion 2. Islington Branch: The value of advertising the Party and its principles on the envelopes of all postal correspondence.

Islington Delegate: We are very much concerned with advertising the Party's name and address and Party pamphlets on all envelopes used by the Party.

Glasgow City Delegate: We might consider having a franking machine with various slogans, which could be printed on all Party envelopes.

General Secretary: This was suggested many years ago and when I first became Gen Sec. a representative came to see me but eventually he agreed that unless we were using a lot of envelopes, about 2-300 per day we would not gain the thing pay from a business proposition. There could be a saving by having a stamp or having envelopes stamped with a slogan. We might have a try.

Harrow Branch: Although I think slogan advertising on letters is of some value it is very limited. All franked letters have to be bundled up and taken to the Post Office by a certain time.

Ex. E.C. Member: I would quite like a lot of correspondence to the branches every week and I think that all correspondence should be in plain envelopes because some members might be annoyed by such a stamp on the envelope.

Highbury Branch Delegate: The "fixes" in the post on correspondence sent to members addresses as "comrades".

Kelvin Grove Delegate: We don't know how much it would cost. What would it put, "Printer of the world unit?".

Literature. A resolution Hackney Branch "That at the next Conference the Ed. Com. be instructed to increase the Editorial Committee to six members along the lines suggested in section 5 of the Socialist Standard. Investigation Committee's report."

Amendment Bradford Branch. Delete "six" and insert instead "three".

Hackney Delegates. It must be clear what is intended in this matter by now, namely item 5 of the S.S. Investigation Report. We think as at present constituted the Ed.Com. cannot act on this. Letters which are too long are returned to the writers for shortening. We must make sure that the Ed.Com. works efficiently. Articles should be commissioned on topical issues as they come along. These things could be sorted out if there was a larger committee.

Bradford Delegates. We considered this to be too heavy and we have not gone through the report properly and owing to the division of labour suggested in the report we feel that this will be better and don't want Conference to support our amendment.

General Secretary gave information on the appointment of the new S.S. Production Committee.

Paddington Delegates. I would like to amplify some of Hackney's statement which I am taking from the Paddington Circular re. long term planning of issues. This is not as difficult as it may appear. It simply means working to a programme; so that the Committee can work towards a given aim over a set period, the length of which they can determine for themselves. This would enable a sense of continuity to be achieved, as well as making the work easier, because it would eliminate rushing to get each issue out within a few days. Articles not of current importance can be allocated to a particular issue leaving sufficient space for articles of immediate interest.

Training and encouraging of writers: One of the chief problems of the Editorial Committee is the supply of appropriate articles. Therefore it must be part of their function to train and encourage writers. And this I suggest could be the specific function of one member of the committee.

Regular meetings with writers and others concerned with the Standard. The present system of remote control between the Editorial Committee and writers is not in the least helpful. The supply of articles is dependent in the main upon what writers happen to send in. This in principle alone is no way to run a responsible paper. Regular meetings as outlined in the Paddington Circular should be held so that the work of producing the S.S. may be organised and co-ordinated. We cannot hope to get complete coverage of world events unless we sit down to the business of allocating certain jobs to certain members, to take a study of, so that we may have well informed articles. Not only on Party theory, but on World affairs in general. It is important to realise that writers must work together as a team, and I suggest that this would be a considerable incentive to productivity.

Nottingham Delegates. The E.C. has in a sense carried out the letter of the suggestions of the S.S. Investigation Committee but in effect the operation of the Ed.Com. has not changed. We still have 3 members whose activities are the same as they always were. The layout man merely carries out a technical task. The real intention behind the six members of the Ed.Com. is not that they should be whittled away in layout but that they should have equal responsibility to carry out a policy for the S.S. something different to what has happened in the past. The 3 members in the past have been overworked. They have not been able to keep a liaison between writers. At present we have 20 articles from the writers class recently running. The writers must be a unit who are well aware of the policy of the S.S. and the function of the Committee who are particularly interested in a particular project. The 6 are not to be technical specialists, but an editorial board. We could not have an actual editor.

~~Committee~~ Hampstead Delegate. The resolution says on the lines of the S.S. Investigation Committee report which says 3 editorial members.

E.C. Member. The E.C. passed and put into operation a resolution which was given the Ed. Com. a rather different aspect this year. Nottingham Delegate has said this has carried out the letter and not the spirit of the report. The E.C.'s resolution is not a carrying out of a report, it is a totally different proposition. The E.C. appointed an Editorial Committee of 3 members supplemented by a secretary and a layout man. The committee has had a secretary for years. The report wanted as much attention directed towards new writers as possible and a member of the Committee to especially have this task. This was not done and was given no attention in the constitution of the Ed. Com. The report always wanted a close liaison between the Ed. Com. and the Publicity of the S.S. This has not been done. The E.C.'s resolution is in no way an implementation of the report. The S.S. Investigation Committee came continually against the Ed. Com's case that there were not enough writers producing good stuff.

Bloomsbury Delegate. There has been very little said about the type of S.S. that was quite successful in the old days.

E.C. Member. Coster seems to champion the idea that we should absorb into the S.S. Committee the C.L.S.C. Publicity Committee, writers class, Central Organiser etc. because all those people are concerned with the production of the S.S. When the E.C. came to consider how they were going to carry out the proposals, they found we already had a C.L.S.C. whose job it was to do this sort of thing. The S.S. is the responsibility of the whole membership and the idea of having a sales manager on the Ed. Com. which will have any effect on the falling sales is not correct. This can only be done by the recognition of the crucial need for more work on the part of the membership.

Paddington Delegate. We have had two different statements from the Ed. Com. on this matter in the last few years - we have not had sufficient writers - we want more articles to go into the S.S. and the Editorial members have at times had to write articles specially to fill up spaces. Also we have been told that pamphlets and the like being written by the Ed. Com. have had to be shelved because the Ed. Com. have been too busy on the S.S. It does not mean that we have got to have a meeting of the 6 Ed. Co. members each time and they have to agree on everything. If some members are doing other jobs such as writing etc. the other members can do the Editorial work. I see no reason to suggest that the editorial board would be cumbersome. We cannot get a liaison between writers unless the editorial board themselves are good writers. If we are to improve the S.S. we must have an editorial board which is elastic enough to operate without the necessity of including all six members.

Hampstead Delegate. Hampstead is supporting the resolution. I think the S.S. Investigation Committee have gone a bit too far and overstated their case because if they had not stipulated the functions of the members of the Ed. Com. this would not have arisen. They did say 3 members concerned with editorial matters. Rule 17 covers all contingencies.

E.C. Member. Paddington delegates' contribution showed the weakness. While they wanted six members only 3 would be engaged on the editorial work. The comrade pointed out that it would not be necessary for all 6 members to do the editorial work. That is the weakness of the proposal. It has been found by experience that they have been able to get the work done as efficiently with 3 members as with any other number. It is vital that the S.S. should be sound and above reproach on the Party's case, and that it should be out regularly. I cannot see why this job cannot be done by 3 members.

Cambridge Delegate. Barely the Ed. Com. are the ones to say whether they need any assistance. Ed. Co. member has mentioned in the past that the most difficulty arises in getting the S.S. out on time.

Conference Adjourned for Lunch.

A telegram sending Fraternal Greetings , from A.Hart of South Africa was read.

Sunday Afternoon Session.

Literature. Contd.

Fulham & Chelsea Delegate. It seems there has been much misunderstanding on the purposes of these proposals. The spirit should be regarded rather than the details as they may not be quite clear. I think it means that the 6 members should have equal responsibility and that they should all be good writers and be able to replace each other if necessary. I think the improved S.S. means a lot more work would have to be done and I think the function of the 3 Editorial members is large enough...work, and could not take on extra work and that is one of the reasons why the Ed. Com. must be enlarged. The whole 5 or 6 members would have basically one function - to produce the best S.S. we can possibly produce.

Hackney Delegate. First of all it seems to be a feeling amongst certain members that the S.S. is not good enough but that it is not the layout or contents, but rather that it ought to be canvassed more. You cannot push sales of the S.S. by the mere process of canvassing. Outdoor meetings are not dead, but they are not in a flourishing state. It is the contents that matter when we are selling the S.S. It does not possess those contents. From the point of view of content of the S.S. by and large it is a very inadequate paper and I don't want to canvass a very inadequate paper. There can be a Committee formed that will help in that process. If we want a better S.S. we must take steps. The E.C. has not attempted to carry this out. Within their limits the Ed. Com. has worked very hard and very well but it has not been run efficiently. This is not the fault of the Ed. Com. It lies in the fact that the task of the Ed. Com. has been too restricted to carry out things which are necessary. The type of contribution coming in from outside depends on the contributions in the S.S. The report may seem a little ambitious but the Committee said there were several important things which should be done which are not being done at present. They suggested a secretary which I think is the core of the matter. If it is a good idea give it a trial. The secretary could initiate a policy, contact writers etc. The functions of the members could be interchangeable. This has not been seriously discussed. There has been no serious discussion on the E.C. The discussion has never been raised to the level of the task we have in hand. The S.S.'s influence over the years has been weakening seriously and this has nothing to do with book or film reviews. I think you can produce more writers in the party than speakers. We have to think of long term policy - to create a body of writers. This cannot be done merely by running writers classes. The S.S. is the heart and soul of the party. It is round that we must develop .

E.C.Member. I am in agreement with nearly everything Hackney has said. It is easy to make this proposition look an easy matter. It is a technical problem to produce the S.S. each month. I suggest you have not got the answer to it. If the quality of the S.S. has fallen it is in conformity with the lowering of the knowledge of members. If you produce the finest literature it will pile up in the back room at H.O. for the want of activity. We must ask can we do more ourselves to get the circulation increased. There lies the remedy , not whether we have 6 or 5 members on the Ed. Com.

Hackney Delegato.

In answer to the E.C.Member, supposing he is right, then I see the party dying, and that is all. It is a long term project and we hope you will pass this resolution and see that the E.C. carry it out in the spirit we intend it.

Resolution
that in
the to's
17 clc
(showi
why w
oppo

incl
ye
Fu

H

Resolution 8. Bedroom - Moray Branch: Election Manifestos.
This conference instructs the Executive Committee to ensure that in any election manifestos this year our opposition to War and the testing of nuclear, or any other kind of weapons is well bluntly clear, whilst at the same time giving a full consideration (showing familiarity with contemporary anti-nuclear-war weapon literature) why we do not support movements seeking alternatives on the grounds of opposition to a particular kind of war-fare"

Amendment Hornsey Branch: Delete "in any Election manifestos this year" and insert instead "literature is prepared making . . ." Further delete in line 3 of the resolution the words "is to do".

Hampstead Delegate. As the mover of the resolution and the amendment nor not prepared to speak, I will. We feel that there are dangers if this resolution and amendment are carried in that we attract the wrong type of people along to the Party. We have to be very careful when speaking to people of being identified with pacifist movements and left wingers. Our emphasis should always be one of opposition to the capitalist system.

Ex M.C. Member. We should show our difference with the views of these people in our literature.

Hampstead Delegate. We in our branch thought it would open the door to undue emphasis on nuclear disarmament in our election literature.

E.C. Member. We felt the resolution was unnecessarily restricting. Our manifesto in the Borough Council elections must be limited as to number of words and we may not wish to use this matter in our election literature.

Amendment Carried 27 - 18.

Sub Res Carried 30 - 15.

REPORT of Conference Committee on Kelvin Grove and Glasgow City Complaints

Hampson For the Committee. The Committee was set up to investigate complaints by the two branches. Concerning Propaganda activities they did not consider there had been enough liaison between H.O. and the branches. There were several financial questions mainly concerned with delegates expenses and they made several criticisms and complaints which boiled down to the lack of liaison between the two branches and H.O. - letters going astray etc. We brought in representatives of the propaganda committee and some E.C. members. Our suggestions and recommendations are as follows:-

(1) Prop. Com. That in future any propaganda proposals for Scotland should automatically be communicated to all the branches and groups in Scotland and at the same time asking the branches and groups to co-operate and give assistance if possible.

(2). That the propaganda Committee and the E.C. when they communicate with the Scottish branches should deal with official branch representatives and not individual members. Some criticism arose of cases where committees had communicated with individual members which resulted in all sorts of things going on without the knowledge of the branches.

(3) A specific criticism about correspondence which has been going on between the 2 branches and the Prop. Com. about payments of grants and expenses to individual members. The branches wanted to get some general idea of what had been going on and the general expenses etc. There has been some delay in replying from the Prop. Com. but the Committee will be communicating with the 2 branches very shortly. Generally, On the question of Propaganda the committee are of the opinion that there has been a lack of liaison between the Prop. Com. and the Scottish branches and we suggest steps be taken to remedy this.

(4). Finance, and in particular delegates' expenses. All sorts of anomalies have arisen and the history of the last few years of those 2 branches seems to be rather vague, and ill defined. Recommendation: The lack of any definite rule or procedure must inevitably lead to such cases. The E.C. should look seriously into the whole question of delegates' expenses and representation and Delegate Meetings and Conference and perhaps consider if they think it worth whilst to appoint a small committee to look into the matter and report back and take any action. The E.C. may themselves want to look at the matter rather than a committee. Certain decisions seem to have been made on the spur of the moment and there is a lot of confusion about the whole question of delegates' expenses. The branches did feel, rightly or wrongly, that the branches were suffering under a lot of resentment about various things. One thing was that they had a letter from the Finance Committee to whose terms they rather objected. We do think that the letter was rather regrettably worded and the branches' resentment on that was quite justified. We got the impression that there have been faults on both sides most of which are associated with difficulties of branches being so far away and to communications by letter lacking clarity etc.

(5). General liaison between H.O. and the 2 branches on correspondence etc. We did not have time to go into this but we suggest that Kelvin Grove and Glasgow City branches should make a list of the various complaints under this heading and any problems they think arise and communicate this to the E.C. for the E.C. to consider and give the 2 branches a report. I think the meeting generally did some good.

Resolution Young (Hampstead & Francis (Islington) "That the report be adopted and recommendations be forwarded to the E.C. for its consideration".

AGREED.

FLOOR RESOLUTION Cox, Fulham & Chelsea) & May (Paddington):

"That this Conference recommends that a sum of £10 per month in addition to any amount spent on advertising be used for improving the distribution, production and quality of the S.S."

Fulham Delegate. We felt that if these other factors which we have mentioned were left out of this resolution, our aim would not be fully achieved - that it would be a good thing to spend £10 but that there was a need for financial assistance towards the improvement of the S.S. as apart from advertising.

RESOLUTION CARRIED .6 - 7.

Item For Discussion E. Glasgow City: Improvements to Party Literature.

Glasgow City Delegate. We think there could be great improvement in the layout of the S.S. but we also feel that the whole membership must get down to the business of solving the problem of the poor quality of the S.S.

Dartford Delegate. There must be certain techniques for canvassing. There must be some reason for the downward trend of sales, not just the articles may not be so good. We should concentrate on the technique of canvassing.

Fulham & Chelsea Delegate. Some of the points raised by the Glasgow City branch would help towards the end of improving Party Literature. The branches should do all they can to help in production of the S.S. Perhaps we could ask for cuttings of interest and items from various journals etc. together with the knowledge that the future of the S.S. is in members hands.

PROPAGANDA. Item for Discussion E. Hackney Branch: Paid Propaganda and methods of financing it.

Hackney Delegate. We sent round a circular on methods of financing the Party and have visited some branches. We suggested that before we could go into any regular activity we wanted a regular income. Br nephos at the moment who are thinking of doing something hope that the money

will come in somehow but their plans are limited by the fact that they have not much money. We suggested there are some members who now donate generously but it spasmodic. I don't think this is a very business-like way. We are suggesting that all Party Members through their branch secretaries shall be asked to enter into a voluntary agreement with the Party to donate a sum of money which they can afford with the promise that this will be regular. The Party will then know what income they will get regularly, and be able to budget for regular activity. We could have large eye catching posters. We would need a paid secretary and paid organiser. We could think in terms of a weekly S.S.

Camberwell Delegate. The branch has discussed this and come to the conclusion that this is doomed to failure from the start. Members are taxed enough now by fares to and from H.H. meetings, donations etc. and we are of the opinion that the Party should get their money at meetings and by selling literature.

Lewisham Delegate. The branch is opposed to this idea as we see it in the form of a levy. Our treasurers have enough of a job to get the dues paid. To pass a resolution of this sort at Conference you have to see that the machinery is in operation to collect it and how are you going to enforce it. It won't mean a thing without a rule of some means of collecting. It would become a condition of membership.

Bloomsbury Delegate. This question has been going on for many years. We had 2 hot meetings on a levy years ago and it was turned down. When something worthwhile comes along, the money will be forthcoming.

Hackney Delegate. The reason these proposals have been put forward is to get things regularised because we think one of the essentials for putting the Party on a progressive basis is first to get ourselves on a sound financial basis. 5/- is about an hours wages and we think members should be prepared to put this in. We recognise there will be people precluded from doing this. It opens up a wider field of activity for propaganda, advertising etc.

E.C. Member. I would like delegates to go to their branches and discuss this. There is the question of where is the Party's money to come from. There have been resolutions passed for financing the S.S. advertising etc and it all costs money. I don't think there should be anything in the way of a financial obstacle to members being in the Party.

Ex E.C. Member. I would like to throw out the suggestion that the Conference calls branch treasurers to a meeting to discuss Party finance.

FLOOR RESOLUTION. - Glassov (Hackney) & Read Hackney):

"That this Conference recommends that branch secretaries enquire into the possibility of getting members to contribute regularly on a voluntary basis for the purposes of paid propaganda".

Hackney Delegate. We have already discussed the item, and the resolution arises out of the discussion. The whole point is to get a regular income. No one is suggesting a levy. We are thinking of those people who never come to the branches. Even dues do not stand in the way of membership of the Party. Don't go to the pictures once a week - make a sacrifice for the Party.

Fulham Delegate. If we don't pay the money we get no results. Here is a good suggestion. Those who cannot afford anything are in the minority as are those who contribute £100. Our branch is of the opinion that unless something like this takes place, we might as well shut up shop.

Kilvingrove Delegate. The real position is that it is a waste of time. They ought to send their donations to H.O. Quite a lot of members donate more than 5/- a week. The Party should engage in activity which brings in money.

E.C. Member. Hackney delegate has still got to get hold of the other members of his branch apart from the 12 active ones to get their money.

The whole scheme depends on 700 members contributing 5/- a week. The declining income from sales of the S.S. is a reflection on the declining activities of the Party. A good guide would be to look at the return of the annual ballot for E.C. members.

Hampstead Delegate. I don't see any harm at all in giving this a trial. There is no compulsion about it and the figure of 5/- is purely arbitrary.

E.C. Member. This is not merely for and against. The fact of taking part in Party activity is expensive, e.g. cost of members coming to Conference this weekend.

E.C. Member. The active members here are already committed to their branch funds and other contributions at meetings etc. Hackney should try this in their branch and see that it is not a practical proposition. We must first have a programme of activity before we get the money out of members.

Hackney Delegate. I don't feel delegates have dealt with out proposition. We have suggested an organised effort. We cannot have the money until we have the activity, but we cannot have the activity until we have the money.

Resolution Carried. 19 - 15.

ELECTORAL ACTIVITY (Parliamentary Committee.) We are asking for funds in view of the forthcoming election and we need help for addressing envelopes from 7th April.

Nottingham Delegate. Electoral activity is mainly concerned with the Party's case. We may consider electoral activity is not just an affair of the moment but create the idea that in the sense of making socialists it is there all the time and I would like members to consider the continuation of this sort of concentrated effort which could take place in Nottingham.

E.C.'s Report to Conference was adopted on the motion of Mitchell (Camberwell) and Devoreaux (Bradford).

Item H. For Discussion: Paddington. The Socialist attitude to Rent control.

Paddington Delegate. This was put on the agenda because of the controversy written by various members on this subject. This is not necessarily the view of Paddington branch as the branch wanted it discussed here. In Forum we had two opposing points of view. Trotman says the Party should have made some definite statement in regard to rent control. He was saying the Party should support rent control. Hardy put the Party's point of view that the only way to solve the problems of rent control is to get Socialism. Trotman is pointing out that that sort of argument is all right except when it affects one personally. The working class attitude is one which reformists are quick to seize upon. This idea has been manifest - that there are two sorts of people, those born to lead and the majority who are stupid and need to be led. While it may be all right for Hardy to make a correct analysis it does not carry sympathy and this links up in my view with all that I have been saying on the question of the S.S. Are we putting our propaganda in a way in which the working class with all their contradictions and apathy are likely to be sympathetic towards. I don't want to see any member saying that the workers should struggle for rent control or any reform at all. We are here to tell workers about Socialism. It is necessary to analyse the situation in relation to Socialism. We don't get over to workers that way. I think Trotman has something by saying it is not just a bold statement of facts which interests workers but on the other hand if he thinks that the Party should take sides on reform then I am opposed to it.

I think the problem for the Party is to comment upon every aspect of the economic and political situation including everything that human beings do in a way which can be attractive and acceptable and something which will arouse interest without emasculating our D.of P. and deteriorating into reformism. Paddington's attitude to rent

control is Hardy's view that this Party is not reformist but should make comment on reforms and show their inadequacies. I think that Trotman is on the verge of putting a reformist position. I take the attitude that there is a divergence of opinion between Mayes, Trotman and Hardy. Hardy's article is an unsympathetic approach.

E.C.Member. The statement in Forum is an E.C. statement. The Economics of Rent Control was an article in the S.S. and when dealing with the economics of rent control one is not concerned with taking a warm-blooded attitude. Walters reads Trotman's article as saying that we should support rent control. What earthly good would it be to the Working class if the S.P. did put it record that we support rent control. It would be of no use whatever to the working class and it would of course be fatal to the S.P. and the Party has in fact on this issue done something and that is that rent control has never been in the interests of the working class. Trotman put forward an argument about evictions but this has nothing to do with rent control at all. The S.P. has taken the correct attitude on this matter. Some groups have made some incidental gain. We have to look at rent control from the point of view of the working class. The Party has never been concerned with rent control but when the working class have been in a good bargaining position the capitalists have wanted to be in a position to make wage restraints and rent control was one way of doing it. We have said don't believe you will gain by wage restraint, but struggle for higher wages. The Party has been right to tell workers use your weapon on the industrial field. The Party has made a real contribution not to the people who have been advocating rent control. Certain members are under the impression that some members since 1910 are prepared to act differently towards some useful reforms. This was not true. The 1910 controversy had nothing to do with some reforms being good or bad. It made no difference to the Party's attitude to reforms.

Nottingham Delegate. The Party's way of stating its opposition to reformism does in fact appear to be cold. This business of reformism is not an easy thing to put across to workers. We must remember that as well as preaching Socialism more important is to talk about the analysis of Capitalism and what workers must do.

Fulham Delegate. Fulham is involved in this matter to the extent that Mayes is a member of this branch and he raised the question before the branch and asked the branch to deal with it. This matter of rent control has been raised to the level of reforms in general. / He queried the clarity of the Party's position in regard to reforms in general and read out statements that appeared to me to require clarification.

E.C.Member. This is a very old chestnut. It is a discussion really on whether the S.P. should support reforms. We should try to bridge the gap between the cold scientific approach and a more sympathetic approach.

E.C.Member. If a Socialist M.P. goes forward on the basis of Socialism the fact of one socialist getting elected in isolation would imply that you had one lone constituency struggling for Socialism. If we support reforms we would get stamped in reformism.

Newport Delegate. This refers specifically to rent control not to reforms. The Party is clear in that it opposes anything which disrupts working class unity.

E.C.Member. Fulham Branch should read Socialism again. If you are in favour of rent control you will go on to be in favour of other subsidies. This is the reason for our opposition to declaring on our platform that we are in favour of any particular reform.